

Substance Abuse and Crime Prevention Act of 2000: Analysis of Plans from the 58 Counties

This report was developed by Health Systems Research, Inc., for the Center for Substance Abuse Treatment of the Substance Abuse and Mental Health Services Administration, and the California Department of Alcohol and Drug Programs under Contract No. 270-00-7071.

Prepared by:

William E. Ford, Ph.D.
Senior Associate
Health Systems Research, Inc.
Washington, D.C.

14 March 2003

Table of Contents

Executive Summary	ii
A. Purpose of This Document.....	1
B. Analysis of the Plans for the 12 Large Counties	2
C. Analysis of the Plans for the 9 Medium-sized Counties.....	10
D. Analysis of the Plans for the 37 Small Counties	17
E. Summary of the County Plans	28

Appendix A

Table A1.	List of Services: 12 Large Counties.....	A1
Table A2.	List of Services: 9 Medium-sized Counties.....	A2
Table A3.	List of Services: 37 Small Counties.....	A3

Executive Summary¹

The regulations promulgated pursuant to the California Substance Abuse and Crime Prevention Act (SACPA) of 2000 require that all counties submit a plan (§9515(b)(2), Chapter 2.5, Division 4, Title 9, California Code of Regulations (CCR)) to the Department of Alcohol and Drug Programs (ADP) in order to receive funding for services covered by the Act. The purpose of this document is to summarize the highlights of the fiscal year (FY) 2002/03 county plans. Each plan contains a programmatic and a fiscal section. The programmatic section includes a description of the SACPA services to be offered, how SACPA services will be coordinated, and the process for developing the plans. The fiscal section describes how counties plan to expend SACPA funds, as well as projections for capacity and services.

There are several significant highlights of the analysis of all 58 counties, including:

- The 58 counties projected 62,377 referrals will be made for SACPA services during FY 2002/03. A vast majority (89.5%) of these referrals will come from the court/probation system. This compares with the FY 2001/02 estimate of 70,718 referrals.
- Fifty-seven (98.3%) of the 58 counties planned to do drug testing of SACPA clients using funds from the Substance Abuse Treatment and Testing Accountability (SATTA) Program. In 2001/02 prior to enactment of SATTA, 51 counties planned to use drug testing.
- Fifty-five (94.8%) of the 58 counties indicated that substance abuse treatment professionals would be responsible for the assessment and placement of SACPA-eligible clients.
- All of the 58 counties reported expending funds in FY 2001/02, and 56 (96.6%) of the counties had carryover funds to expend in future years.
- The average percentage of funds planned to be spent for FY 2002/03 by the 58 counties is 85.8% (range: 24.3% to 127.3%)². For FY 2001/02, the average planned to be spent was 57.8% (range: 5.1% to 100.0%).
- The average percentage of funds planned to be spent for services (drug treatment and other services) by the 58 counties for FY 2002/03 is 78.5% (range: 51.0% to 100.0%); and the average percentage planned to be spent for criminal justice activities is 21.5% (range: 0% to 49.0%). The corresponding amounts for FY 2001/02 were 80.0% (range: 51.0% to 100.0%) for services and 20.0% (range: 0 to 49.0%) for criminal justice.

¹ This analysis was funded by the Center for Substance Abuse Treatment (CSAT) in connection with CSAT's "State Health Care Reform Technical Assistance, and Knowledge Synthesis and Dissemination Project" (Contract No. 270-00-7071). The author wishes to thank Ms. Natalie Solomon, Mr. John O'Donnell, M.A., and Mr. Matthew Clune, M.S., for their contributions to this analysis.

² Planned expenditures exceeding 100% may reflect changes in the amount of carryover funds reported by a county after its plan was approved. This does not necessarily mean that the county is planning to expend more than its available funds.

- Forty-six (79.3%) of the 58 counties projected an average increase in total capacity of services during FY 2002/03 of 78.3%. In FY 2001/02, 55 (94.8%) planned for an average increase in total capacity of 677.9%.

Table E-1 summarizes key provisions of the county plans.

	Projected Rate of SACPA Referrals per 1000 Population	% Using Substance Abuse Treatment Professionals for Assessment and Placement	% Planned to be Expended from FY 2001/02 Allocation Based upon FY 2001/02 County Plans	% Planned to be Expended of FY 2002/03 Allocation Plus Carryover	% of FY 2002/03 Allocation Plus Carryover Planned for Expenditure for Services	% of FY 2002/03 Anticipated Total (drug treatment & other services) Capacity Increase
Large Counties	1.5	91.7%	52.4%	87.2%	79.4%	17.7%
Medium-sized Counties	3.0	88.9%	59.7%	88.0%	82.3%	44.9%
Small Counties	2.1	97.3%	59.1%	84.9%	77.6%	80.6%*

These observations are based upon means for each county grouping. Means can be misleading without consideration of their variability.

There are some important differences across county size (large, medium, and small). For example, the anticipated rate of referrals per 1,000 population is highest for the medium-sized counties, indicating that they are expecting SACPA to have greater effect than the large or small counties. The expected increase in total capacity is highest among the small counties. The average of the total capacity increase for the 37 small counties is 80.6%, which is influenced by six counties reporting over a 100.0% capacity increase. If these six counties were not included in determining this average, then the increase in capacity for small counties is comparable (20.0%) to the other counties (large and medium).

A. Purpose of This Document

The regulations promulgated under the California Substance Abuse and Crime Prevention Act (SACPA) of 2000 require that all counties submit a plan (§9515(b)(2), Ch. 2.5, Div. 4, Title 9, CCR) to the Department of Alcohol and Drug Programs (ADP) in order to receive funding for services covered by this Act. The purpose of this document is to summarize the highlights of the FY 2002/03 plans submitted by the counties. The plans contain a programmatic and a fiscal section. The

programmatic section includes a description of the SACPA services to be offered, how SACPA services will be coordinated, and the process for developing the plans. The fiscal section describes how counties plan to expend SACPA funds, and projections for capacity and services.³

The analysis of the programmatic portion of each county plan includes:

- Identification of the lead agency chosen;
- A description of the planning process;
- The types of SACPA services planned;
- The anticipated referrals from probation and parole;
- The planned use of drug testing; and
- Client assessment and placement procedures.

The analysis of the fiscal portion of each county plan includes:

- A discussion of the amount of funds allocated and planned to be spent for FY 2001/02;
- Overall funds planned to be spent in each of the counties for FY 2002/03;
- The amount of funds planned to be spent for services and criminal justice activities; and
- Projected capacity.

This document provides an analysis of the county plans grouped by county size. The counties are divided into three groups according to population: large (N=12), medium-sized (N=9), and small (N=37). This categorization is based upon that developed by the County Alcohol and Drug Program Administrators Association of California (CADPAAC).

An analysis of the programmatic and fiscal sections of the plans for each of the three categories of counties will be provided. The programmatic discussion includes identification of the lead agencies chosen, a description of the planning process, the types of SACPA services planned, the anticipated number of referrals from probation or parole, the use of drug testing, and client assessment and placement procedures. The fiscal analysis includes a discussion of the amount of funds allocated and planned to be spent for FY 2001/02, overall funds planned to be spent in each of the counties for FY 2002/03, the amount of funds planned to be spent for services and criminal justice activities, and projected capacity.

³ This document contains text boxes summarizing information contained in the FY 2001/02 and FY 2002/03 county plans. These summaries are for information only and may not reflect actual trends. These summaries usually involve only percentage comparisons over one or two years. The county plans are designed to forecast how funds are planned to be used. They are not an accounting for how funds were or are actually used, particularly as those expenditures relate to actual services delivered.

B. Analysis of the Plans for the 12 Large Counties

This section of the document provides an analysis of the plans for the 12 large counties, consisting of: Alameda, Contra Costa, Fresno, Los Angeles, Orange, Riverside, Sacramento, San Bernardino, San Diego, San Francisco, Santa Clara, and Ventura. The combined population of these counties is 26.9 million or approximately 77% of the State's total population, based upon January 1, 2002 population estimates⁴. The total amount of funds available to these counties for FY 2002/03 is \$144,626,953, which is 74.8% of the total SACPA funds available (\$193,273,513) for the counties for the year. The total funds available in FY 2002/03 includes funds carried over from FY 2001/02.

1. Programmatic Analysis

The following sections summarize the programmatic information required by SACPA regulations for the county plans.

a. Lead Agency

Ten (83.3%) of these 12 large counties designated their behavioral health or alcohol and drug services agency/division as the lead agency for coordinating SACPA services. One county designated the county executive office and one designated the health care agency as the lead agency. None of the 12 large counties designated probation or other criminal justice departments as the lead agency.

In FY 2002/03, 10 (83.3%) of these 12 large counties designated their behavioral health or alcohol and drug services agency/division as the lead agency for coordinating SACPA services.

During FY 2001/02, seven (58.3%) of these counties designated their behavioral health or alcohol and drug services agency/division as the lead agency.

b. Planning Process

All of the 12 large county plans indicated that "impacted community parties" were involved in the FY 2002/03 SACPA planning process. The entities involved varied across counties. Five (41.7%) of these county plans stated specifically that "clients/client groups" were involved in the process, and five (41.7%) of the 12 large county plans said that they had federally recognized American Indian tribes in their county, and that these tribes were part of the SACPA planning process.

⁴ State of California, Department of Finance, *City/County Population and Housing Estimates*, 2002, Revised 2001, with 2000 Census Counts. Sacramento, California, May 2002.

c. Types of Services

Table A1 in Appendix A lists the types of services and activities anticipated to be provided to SACPA-eligible clients, using each of the 19 sub-categories of services that have been identified by ADP.

d. Client Population (Parole and Probation)

The 12 large counties have estimated that a total of 41,616 referrals will be made to SACPA services during FY 2002/03. See Table 1 for estimates by county of referrals (number and percentage of total) from either the

court/probation or parole systems, as well as the total number of referrals estimated for FY 2002/03.

For the 12 large counties:

- **Between FY 2001/02 and FY 2002/03, the estimates of parole and court/probation referrals for SACPA services decreased by 9.7% (from 46,089 to 41,616 referrals).**
- **In comparing the FY 2001/02 and 2002/03 county plans, seven of the 12 large counties estimated a decrease in the number of projected referrals, four estimated an increase, and one estimated no change.**

Table 1					
Estimated Referrals (number and percentage) by Source for the 12 Large Counties for FY 2002/03					
County Name	Referrals from Court/Probation		Referrals from Parole		Total Estimated Number of Referrals
	Number	%	Number	%	
Alameda	2,062	97.0%	64	3.0%	2,126
Contra Costa	854	93.1%	63	6.9%	917
Fresno	1,100	84.6%	200	15.4%	1,300
Los Angeles	14,200	94.7%	800	5.3%	15,000
Orange	4,000	85.9%	657	14.1%	4,657
Riverside	3,000	93.8%	200	6.2%	3,200
Sacramento	955	74.9%	320	25.1%	1,275
San Bernardino	1,330	76.9%	400	23.1%	1,730
San Diego	4,060	83.0%	831	17.0%	4,891
San Francisco	714	70.0%	306	30.0%	1,020
Santa Clara	2,760	92.0%	240	8.0%	3,000
Ventura	2,325	93.0%	175	7.0%	2,500
12-County Total	37,360	89.8%	4,256	10.2%	41,616

e. Drug Testing

Drug treatment programs often use drug testing to monitor an individual's compliance with treatment. Frequency of drug testing should reflect the clinical status of the client, based upon severity of abuse, progress in treatment, and/or relapse potential. Programs also randomly administer drug testing to monitor clients' compliance. In FY 2002/03, the California legislature passed the Substance Abuse Treatment and Testing Accountability Program (SB 223, Chapter 721, Statutes of 2001) that appropriated funds to the counties to conduct drug testing of SACPA-eligible clients. All 12 of the large counties plan to conduct such tests in FY 2002/03.

f. Assessment and Placement

Eleven (91.7%) of the 12 large counties said that substance abuse treatment professionals would be involved with the assessment and placement of SACPA-eligible clients. Six (50.0%) of these counties stated that multiple entities (e.g., alcohol/drug treatment

agency, probation, courts) would be responsible for the assessment and placement process.

Eleven (91.7%) of the 12 large counties plan to use the Addiction Severity Index (ASI) as one of their assessment tools, and one (8.3%) indicated that the ASI would be the only tool used. Eight (66.7%) of the counties also plan to use the American Society of Addiction

Medicine Patient Placement Criteria (ASAM PPC) as one of the assessment tools for SACPA-eligible clients.

For the 12 large counties:

- The average percentage of funds planned to be spent of the FY 2001/02 allocation, according to the county plans, was 52.4% (range: 34.2% to 66.1%).
- For FY 2002/03, the average percentage of funds planned to be spent of the FY 2002/03 allocation is 87.2% (range: 59.4% to 117.2%).

2. Fiscal Analysis

The counties, regardless of size, budgeted for the first year of SACPA implementation, while anticipating needs for the four subsequent years for which the Act is authorized. Many counties budgeted a contingency fund in FY 2001/02 (or "carryover funding") in order to create a flexible reserve that could be spent as the actual impact of SACPA was realized over time. Because counties were uncertain of what the actual SACPA caseload would be, they planned for the possibility that actual caseloads might exceed projections. This was a prudent approach to budgeting where so much uncertainty exists. This section discusses carryover funding, budgeting, and services and activities funding.

a. Funds Planned for Expenditure in FY 2001/02

Table 2 summarizes the FY 2001/02 SACPA total funds available (allocation plus carryover) for the 12 large counties, the county-reported amount planned to be spent, and the percentage planned to be spent.⁵

⁵ The unexpended FY 2001/02 funds are reported as carryover in the FY 2002/03 plans (see Table 3).

Table 2			
Funds Planned to be Spent in FY 2001/02 as Reported by Each Large County			
County Name	Total Funds Available	Available Funds Planned to be Spent (\$) ⁶	Available Funds Planned to be Spent (%) ⁶
Alameda	\$8,119,286	\$2,993,985	36.9%
Contra Costa	\$4,529,543	\$2,529,543	55.9%
Fresno	\$4,219,665	\$1,627,554	38.6%
Los Angeles	\$46,836,323	\$23,235,431	49.6%
Orange	\$11,329,525	\$6,560,445	57.9%
Riverside	\$6,326,807	\$4,156,398	65.7%
Sacramento	\$6,150,673	\$3,011,611	49.0%
San Bernardino	\$8,359,522	\$5,299,814	63.4%
San Diego	\$11,629,841	\$7,006,248	60.2%
San Francisco	\$6,813,070	\$2,331,770	34.2%
Santa Clara	\$6,894,808	\$4,554,187	66.1%
Ventura	\$3,555,495	\$1,841,489	51.8%
12-County Mean	\$10,397,047	\$5,429,040	52.4%

b. Funds Planned for Expenditure for FY 2002/03

The amount of available funds for FY 2002/03 includes the FY 2002/03 State allocation plus any funds unspent from FY 2001/02 (carryover funds). The average percentage of total funds available planned for expenditure in FY 2002/03 by the 12 large counties is 87.2% (range: 59.4% to 100%)⁷. Three of the 12 large counties plan to spend all (100%) of the funds available, while the other nine counties do not plan to expend all available funds for FY 2002/03. The range of funds planned to be spent by these nine counties is between 59.4% and 98.1%. Table 3 summarizes the percentage of available funds in FY 2002/03 planned to be spent by each county.

⁶ The County Plans do not summarize actual expenditures for previous reporting periods. This analysis relies upon data in the 2001/02 county expenditure plans.

⁷ Planned expenditures exceeding 100% may reflect changes in the amount of carryover funds reported by a county after its plan was approved. This does not necessarily mean that the county is planning to expend more than its available funds. Percentages over 100 are not included in the range.

Table 3			
Funds Planned to be Spent in FY 2002/03 as Reported by Each Large County			
County Name	Total Funds Available	Available Funds Planned to be Spent (\$)	Available Funds Planned to be Spent (%)
Alameda	\$10,485,850	\$9,498,890	90.6%
Contra Costa	\$5,238,963	\$4,732,323	90.3%
Fresno	\$5,547,155	\$5,547,155	100.0%
Los Angeles	\$53,949,270	\$38,478,958	71.3%
Orange	\$12,679,550	\$11,165,552	88.1%
Riverside	\$6,496,699	\$5,650,678	87.0%
Sacramento	\$7,488,788	\$5,152,791	68.8%
San Bernardino	\$8,744,591	\$6,577,339	75.2%
San Diego	\$13,478,960	\$15,802,867	117.2%
San Francisco	\$9,169,744	\$9,169,744	100.0%
Santa Clara	\$7,130,170	\$6,998,053	98.2%
Ventura	\$4,217,213	\$2,503,207	59.4%
12-County Mean	\$12,052,246	\$10,106,463	87.2%

c. Services and Activities

This section discusses the various services or activities that will be provided by the 12 large counties, including drug treatment and additional services (vocational training, literacy training, family counseling, etc.), and criminal justice activities (supervision and monitoring). Table 4 summarizes the percentage of funds planned to be spent for services and criminal justice activities for FY 2002/03 for these 12 counties.

1. Services

This category combines drug treatment and other services (i.e., literacy training, vocational training, family counseling) that will be provided by the counties under SACPA. The average percentage of

For the 12 large counties:

- In FY 2001/02, an average of 76.9 % of SACPA funds was planned to be spent on drug treatment and other services.
- In FY 2002/03, an average of 79.4% of SACPA funds is planned to be spent on drug treatment and other services.
- For FY 2001/02, an average of 23.1% of SACPA funds was planned to be spent on probation, supervision, court monitoring and other related activities.
- For FY 2002/03, an average of 20.6% of SACPA funds is planned to be spent on probation, supervision, court monitoring and other related activities.

funds planned for expenditure on drug treatment and other services by these 12 counties is 79.4% (range: 61.4% to 100.0%).

2. Criminal Justice

This category includes funding for probation, supervision, monitoring, and other related activities. This category of service is important because a major component of SACPA is prevention of further drug-related crime. The average percentage of funds planned to be spent on criminal justice activities by the 12 large counties is 20.6% (range: 0% to 38.6%). In comparison, during FY 2001/02 the average amount planned to be spent by these 12 counties was 23.1%.

Table 4			
Percentage of Funds Planned to be Spent for Drug Treatment and Other Services and Criminal Justice Activities for the 12 Large Counties for FY 2002/03			
County Name	Total Amount of Funds Planned to be Spent	Percentage Planned for Services	Percentage Planned for Criminal Justice Activities
Alameda	\$9,498,890	87.1%	12.9%
Contra Costa	\$4,732,323	67.2%	32.8%
Fresno	\$5,547,155	77.8%	22.2%
Los Angeles	\$38,478,958	84.7%	15.3%
Orange	\$11,165,552	80.8%	19.2%
Riverside	\$5,650,678	78.0%	22.0%
Sacramento	\$5,152,791	62.2%	37.8%
San Bernardino	\$6,577,339	61.4%	38.6%
San Diego	\$15,802,867	85.6%	14.4%
San Francisco	\$9,169,744	91.0%	9.0%
Santa Clara	\$6,998,053	77.3%	22.7%
Ventura	\$2,503,207	100.0%	0.0%
12-County Mean	\$10,106,463	79.4%	20.6%

d. Capacity

In FY 2002/03, seven (58.3%) of the 12 large counties plan for an increase in capacity for all categories of services, three (25.0%) plan for an increase in capacity for one category of drug treatment but not all categories, and two (16.7%) counties plan no increase in any category. Ten (83.3%) of these 12 counties plan for an increase in total capacity (drug treatment and other services). The planned average increase in total capacity for these 12

counties is 17.7% (range: 0% to 68.4%). In contrast, the planned average increase in total capacity for the 12 large counties in FY 2001/02 was 40.2%. Table 5 presents the planned service capacity increases for each county for FY 2002/03. This table lists the anticipated capacity increases in non-residential and residential drug treatment and the increase in capacity for drug treatment plus other services.

For the 12 large counties:

- In FY 2001/02, there was a planned 31.2% capacity increase in non-residential drug treatment, a 33.6% increase in residential drug treatment, and a 40.2% increase in drug treatment and other services combined.
- In FY 2002/03, there is a planned 15.7% capacity increase in non-residential drug treatment, a 39.3% increase in residential drug treatment, and a 17.7% increase in drug treatment and other services combined.

Table 5			
Percentage of Planned Increase in Capacity of Non-residential and Residential Drug Treatment, and All Drug Treatment and Other Services by County for the 12 Large Counties for FY 2002/03			
County Name	Capacity Increase in Non-Residential Drug Treatment	Capacity Increase in Residential Drug Treatment	Total Capacity Increase (drug treatment and other services)
Alameda	35.6%	70.2%	43.7%
Contra Costa	0*	0*	0*
Fresno	0*	1.3%	2.2%
Los Angeles	35.6%	29.2%	34.6%
Orange	69.8%	22.3%	68.4%
Riverside	3.9%	39.5%	7.3%
Sacramento	0*	3.3%	0.1%
San Bernardino	0*	0*	0*
San Diego	12.0%	41.6%	14.4%
San Francisco	4.4%	8.3%	13.2%
Santa Clara	0*	33.3%	0.6%
Ventura	26.7%	222.2%	28.2%
Average % Increase	15.7%	39.3%	17.7%

*This may be due to the county's current estimate that its capacity will meet the projected number of referrals for SACPA services.

3. Section Highlights

This section provides highlights of the analysis of the 12 large counties, specifically:

- The average percentage of funds planned to be spent in FY 2002/03 by the 12 large counties is 87.2% (range: 59.4% to 117.2%).
- The average percentage of total available funds planned to be spent on services (drug treatment and other services) by these 12 counties is 79.4% (range: 61.4% to 100.0%); and the average percentage planned for criminal justice activities is 20.6% (range: 0% to 38.6%).
- All (100.0%) of the 12 large counties carried over funds into FY 2002/03.
- The 12 large counties estimated that 41,616 referrals will be made for SACPA services during FY 2002/03. A majority of these referrals will come from the court/probation system.
- Ten (83.3%) of the 12 large county plans project an increase in total capacity of services during FY 2002/03. The average increase in total capacity for these 12 counties is 17.7%.
- All of the 12 large counties plan to expend funds for drug testing of SACPA clients.
- All (100.0%) of the 12 large counties stated that “impacted community parties” were involved in the SACPA planning process. Five (41.7%) said that “clients/client groups” were also involved in the planning process.
- Eleven (91.7%) of the 12 county plans indicated that substance abuse treatment professionals will be responsible for the assessment and placement of SACPA-eligible clients, and six (50.0%) stated that multiple entities will provide these services.

C. Analysis of the Plans for the Nine Medium-sized Counties

This section provides an analysis of plans from the nine medium-sized counties as categorized by CADPAAC. These counties are: Kern, Monterey, San Joaquin, San Mateo, Santa Barbara, Solano, Sonoma, Stanislaus, and Tulare. The combined population of these counties is 4.5 million or approximately 13% of the State’s total population, based upon 2002 population estimates. The total amount of SACPA funds available to the nine medium-sized counties for FY 2002/03 is \$23,801,756, which is 12.3% of the total SACPA funds available (\$193,273,513) for the counties. The total funds available in FY 2002/03 include funds carried over from FY 2001/02. The following analyses are similar to those done for the 12 large counties.

1. Programmatic Analysis

The following sections summarize the information required by SACPA regulations to be in the programmatic section of the county plans.

a. Lead Agency

Seven (77.8%) of the nine medium-sized counties designated the behavioral health or alcohol and drug services agency/division as the lead agency responsible for implementing SACPA-related activities. One of these counties designated the health and human services agency as the lead, and one designated the probation department. There were no changes in lead agency designation between FY 2001/02 and FY 2002/03.

b. Planning Process

All of the nine medium-sized county plans indicated that “impacted community parties”

For the medium-sized counties there were no changes in the county lead agencies between FY 2001/02 and FY 2002/03.

were involved in the planning process. The entities varied across counties. Four (44.4%) of the county plans stated specifically that “clients/client groups” were involved in planning and four (44.4%) of the nine

medium-sized county plans indicated that there were federally recognized American Indian tribes in the county, and that these tribes were part of the SACPA planning process.

c. Types of Services

Table A2 in Appendix A lists the types of services and activities anticipated to be provided to SACPA-eligible clients in the nine medium-sized counties, using each of the 19 sub-categories of services that have been identified by ADP.

For the nine medium-sized counties:

- Between FY 2001/02 and FY 2002/03, the estimates of parole and court/probation referrals for SACPA services decreased by 12.5% (from 15,463 to 13,530).
- In comparing the FY 2001/02 and 2002/03 county plans, five of the nine medium-sized counties estimated a decrease in the number of projected referrals, three estimated an increase, and one reported no change.

d. Client Population (Parole and Probation)

The nine medium-sized counties have estimated that a total of 13,530 referrals will be made to SACPA services during FY 2002/03. See Table 6 for estimates by county of referrals (number and percentage of total) from either the court/probation or parole system, as well as the total number of referrals estimated for FY 2002/03.

Table 6					
Estimated Referrals (number and percentage) by Source for the Nine Medium-sized Counties for FY 2002/03					
County Name	Referrals from Court/Probation		Referrals from Parole		Total Estimated Number of Referrals
	Number	%	Number	%	
Kern	3,200	86.0%	522	14.0%	3,722
Monterey	425	79.1%	112	20.9%	537
San Joaquin	960	90.6%	100	9.4%	1,060
San Mateo	1,513	89.0%	187	11.0%	1,700
Santa Barbara	815	98.0%	17	2.0%	832
Solano	593	89.2%	72	10.8%	665
Sonoma	640	91.4%	60	8.6%	700
Stanislaus	1,200	86.0%	195	14.0%	1,395
Tulare	2,764	94.7%	155	5.3%	2,919
9-County Total	12,110	89.5%	1,420	10.5%	13,530

e. Drug Testing

For FY 2002/03, all nine of the medium-sized counties planned to fund drug testing of SACPA-eligible clients.

f. Assessment and Placement

Eight (88.9%) of the nine medium-sized counties said that substance abuse treatment professionals would be involved with the assessment and placement of SACPA-eligible clients. Five (55.6%) of these counties stated that multiple entities (e.g., alcohol/drug treatment agency, probation, courts) would be responsible for assessment and placement. Seven (77.8%) of the nine medium-sized counties plan to use the ASI as one of the assessment tools, and three (33.3%) said that the ASI would be the only tool used. Five (55.6%) of the counties stated that the ASAM PPC would be one of the assessment tools for SACPA-eligible clients.

For the nine medium-sized counties:

- The average percentage of funds planned to be spent from the FY 2001/02 allocation was 59.8% (range: 26.2% to 100.0%).
- For FY 2002/03, the average percentage of funds planned to be spent is 88.0% (range: 56.8% to 127.3%).

2. Fiscal Analysis

This section discusses funds planned to be spent in FY 2001/02, funds budgeted for FY 2002/03, and services and activities funding in the nine medium-sized counties. As with the large counties, the medium-sized counties planned to carry over funding in order to create a flexible reserve that can be modified or adjusted as the actual impact of SACPA is realized over time.

a. Funds Planned for Expenditure in FY 2001/02

The average percentage of funds planned to be spent of the FY 2001/02 total funds available (allocation plus carryover) for these nine counties was 59.8% (range 26.2% to 100.0%). Table 7 summarizes the FY 2001/02 SACPA allocation for the nine medium-sized counties, the county-reported amount planned to be expended, and the percentage planned to be spent.

Table 7			
Funds Planned to be Spent in FY 2001/02 by County as Reported by Each Medium-sized County			
County Name	Total Funds Available	Available Funds Planned to be Spent (\$)	Available Funds Planned to be Spent (%)
Kern	\$3,319,793	\$3,319,793	100.0%
Monterey	\$1,806,253	\$661,561	36.6%
San Joaquin	\$2,620,818	\$686,419	26.2%
San Mateo	\$3,212,544	\$2,412,544	75.1%
Santa Barbara	\$2,344,700	\$2,102,802	89.7%
Solano	\$1,856,469	\$581,316	31.3%
Sonoma	\$2,455,749	\$1,172,706	47.8%
Stanislaus	\$2,155,049	\$1,566,756	72.7%
Tulare	\$2,001,451	\$1,170,214	58.5%
9-County Mean	\$2,419,203	\$1,519,346	59.8%

b. Funds Planned for Expenditure for FY 2002/03

The amount of available funds for FY 2002/03 includes the FY 2002/03 State allocation plus any funds unspent from FY 2001/02

(carryover funds). The average percentage of funds planned for expenditure in FY 2002/03 by the nine medium-sized counties is 88.0% (range: 56.8% to 100%)⁸. This is almost identical to the average percentage planned to be spent for FY 2001/02 (85.0%). Three of the nine medium-sized counties planned to spend all of the funds available. In comparison, one of these nine counties planned to spend all available funds in FY 2001/02. Six counties do not plan to expend

For the nine medium-sized counties:

- In FY 2001/02, an average of 84.3% of SACPA funds was planned to be spent on drug treatment and other services.
- In FY 2002/03, an average of 82.3% of SACPA funds is planned for drug treatment and other services.
- For FY 2001/02, an average of 15.8% of SACPA funds was planned to be spent on probation, supervision, monitoring and other related activities.
- For FY 2002/03, an average of 17.7% of SACPA funds is planned for criminal justice services.

all available funds for FY 2002/03. The range of percentage of funds planned to be spent by these six counties is from 56.8% and 95.9% of total available funds. Table 8 summarizes the percentage of available funds in FY 2002/03 planned to be spent by each county.

Table 8			
Funds Planned to be Spent in FY 2002/03 as Reported by Each Medium-sized County			
County Name	Total Funds Available	Available Funds Planned to be Spent (\$)	Available Funds Planned to be Spent (%)
Kern	\$2,581,919	\$2,581,919	100.0%
Monterey	\$2,396,779	\$1,361,501	56.8%
San Joaquin	\$3,812,852	\$3,106,977	81.5%
San Mateo	\$2,799,279	\$2,799,279	100.0%
Santa Barbara	\$2,144,493	\$1,902,595	88.7%
Solano	\$2,497,544	\$2,017,022	80.8%
Sonoma	\$3,066,585	\$1,869,828	61.0%
Stanislaus	\$2,153,556	\$2,065,263	95.9%
Tulare	\$2,348,749	\$2,989,782	127.3%
9-County Mean	\$2,644,640	\$2,299,352	88.0%

c. Services and Activities

⁸ Planned expenditures exceeding 100% may reflect changes in the amount of carryover funds reported by a county after its plan was approved. This does not necessarily mean that the county is planning to expend more than its available funds. Percentages over 100 are

This section discusses the various services or activities that will be provided by the nine medium-sized counties, including drug treatment and other services (vocational training, literacy training, family counseling, etc.), and criminal justice activities (supervision and monitoring). Table 9 summarizes the percentages of funds planned to be spent for services and criminal justice activities for FY 2002/03 for these nine counties.

1. Services

This category combines drug treatment and other services (i.e., literacy training, vocational training, family counseling) that will be provided by the counties. The average percentage of funds planned for expenditure on drug treatment and other services by these nine counties is 82.3% (range: 73.4% to 89.8%).

2. Criminal Justice

This category includes funding for probation, supervision, monitoring, and other related activities. The average amount of funds planned to be spent on criminal justice activities by the nine medium-sized counties is 17.7% (range: 10.2% to 26.6%). In comparison, during FY 2001/02 the average amount planned to be spent on criminal justice activities by these nine counties was 15.8%.

Table 9			
Percentage of Funds Planned to be Spent for Drug Treatment and Other Services and Criminal Justice Activities for the Nine Medium-sized Counties for FY 2002/03			
County Name	Total Amount of Funds Planned to be Spent	Percentage Planned for Services	Percentage Planned for Criminal Justice Activities
Kern	\$2,581,919	81.0%	19.0%
Monterey	\$1,361,501	74.6%	25.4%
San Joaquin	\$3,106,977	89.8%	10.2%
San Mateo	\$2,799,279	87.3%	12.7%
Santa Barbara	\$1,902,595	73.4%	26.6%
Solano	\$2,017,022	80.1%	19.9%
Sonoma	\$1,869,828	87.4%	12.6%
Stanislaus	\$2,065,263	79.0%	21.0%
Tulare	\$2,989,782	88.2%	11.8%
9-County Mean	\$2,299,352	82.3%	17.7%

d. Capacity

In FY 2002/03, five (55.6%) of the nine medium-sized counties project an increase in capacity for all categories of services, two (22.2%) project no increase in all categories, and two more (22.2%) project no increase in at least one category. However, seven (77.8%) plan an increase in total drug treatment and other services. The planned average increase in capacity of all services for the nine medium-sized counties is 44.9% (range: 0% to 219.8%). Table 10 presents the anticipated service capacity increases for each county. This table lists the anticipated capacity increases in non-residential and residential drug treatment and the total increase in capacity for drug treatment and other services.

For the nine medium-sized counties:

- In FY 2001/02, there was a projected 142.2% capacity increase in non-residential drug treatment, a 41.0% increase in residential drug treatment, and a 43% increase in drug treatment and other services combined.
- In FY 2002/03, there is a projected 40.5% capacity increase in non-residential drug treatment, a 36.5% increase in residential drug treatment, and a 44.9% increase in drug treatment and other services combined.

Table 10			
Percentage of Planned Increase in Capacity of Non-residential and Residential Drug Treatment, and All Drug Treatment and Other Services by County for the Nine Medium-sized Counties for FY 2002/03			
County Name	Capacity Increase in Non-Residential Drug Treatment	Capacity Increase in Residential Drug Treatment	Total Capacity Increase (drug treatment and other services)
Kern	25.0%	13.6%	24.6%
Monterey	6.3%	0*	5.5%
San Joaquin	62.8%	86.7%	75.2%
San Mateo	210.5%	147.8%	219.8%
Santa Barbara	26.6%	12.8%	38.1%
Solano	0*	0*	0*
Sonoma	0*	0*	0*
Stanislaus	30.8%	68.0%	38.6%
Tulare	2.1%	0*	2.0%
9-County Mean	40.5 %	36.5 %	44.9 %

*This may be due to the county's current estimate that its capacity will meet the projected number of referrals for SACPA services.

3. Section Highlights

This section provides highlights of the analysis of the nine medium-sized counties, specifically:

- The average percentage of funds planned for expenditure in FY 2002/03 by the nine medium-sized counties is 88.0% (range: 56.8% to 127.3%).
- The average percentage of total funds available planned to be spent on services (drug treatment and other services) by these nine medium-sized counties is 82.3% (range: 73.4% to 89.8%); and the average percentage planned for criminal justice activities is 17.7% (range: 10.2% to 26.6%).
- Eight (88.9%) of the nine medium-sized counties carried over funds into FY 2002/03.
- The nine medium-sized counties estimated that 13,530 referrals will be made for SACPA services during FY 2002/03. A majority of these referrals will come from the court/probation system.
- Seven (77.8%) of the nine medium-sized county plans project an increase in total capacity of services during FY 2002/03. The average increase in total capacity for these nine counties is 44.9%.
- All nine counties plan to expend funds for drug testing of SACPA clients.
- All (100.0%) of the nine medium-sized counties stated that “impacted community parties” were involved in the SACPA planning process. Four (44.4%) said that “clients/client groups” were also involved in the planning process.
- Four (44.4%) counties indicated that there were federally recognized American Indian tribes in the county, and that these tribes were part of the SACPA planning process.

D. Analysis of the Plans for the 37 Small Counties

This section of the document provides an analysis of the remaining 37 counties, categorized as small by CADPAAC⁹. The combined population of these 37 counties is 3.5 million or approximately 10% of the state’s total population, based upon 2002 population estimates. The total amount of funds available for the 37 counties for FY 2002/03 is \$24,844,804 or 12.9% of the total SACPA funds available (\$193,273,513) for the year.

- In FY 2002/03, 33 (89.2%) of the 37 small counties designated their behavioral health or alcohol and drug services agency/division as the lead agency responsible for implementing SACPA services.
- In comparison, during FY 2001/02, 25 (67.6%) of the small counties designated the behavioral health or alcohol and drug services agency/division as the lead agency.

The total FY 2002/03 allocation to these counties includes funds carried over from FY 2001/02.

1. Programmatic Analysis

The following sections summarize the programmatic information required by SACPA regulations to be in the county plans.

⁹ See Table 11 for a list of small counties.

a. Lead Agency

Thirty-three (89.2%) of the 37 small counties designated their behavioral health or alcohol and drug services agency/division as the lead agency responsible for implementing SACPA-related activities. Three (8.1%) of these 37 counties designated the public health or health services agencies as the lead agency, and one (2.7%) of the small counties designated the administration. In comparison, 25 (67.6%) of the small counties designated the behavioral health or alcohol and drug services agency/division as the lead agency in FY 2001/02.

b. Planning Process

All (100.0%) of these county plans indicated that “impacted community parties” were involved in the planning process. The entities varied across counties. Only eight (21.6%) of the county plans stated specifically that “clients/client groups” were involved. Twenty-three (62.2%) of the county plans indicated that there were federally recognized American Indian tribes in the county, and that these tribes were part of the SACPA planning process.

c. Types of Services

All of the 37 small counties described the specific services that are to be funded and provided under SACPA. Table A3 in Appendix A lists the types of services and activities anticipated to be provided to SACPA-eligible clients in the 37 small counties, using each of the 19 sub-categories of services that have been identified by ADP.

For the 37 small counties:

- Between FY 2001/02 and FY 2002/03, the estimates of parole and court/probation referrals for SACPA services decreased by 21.5% (from 9,186 to 7,207 referrals).
- In comparing the FY 2001/02 and 2002/03 county plans, twenty-one counties estimated a decrease in the projected number of referrals, seven estimated an increase in referrals, and nine estimated no change.

d. Client Population (Probation and Parole)

The 37 small counties have estimated that a total of 7,231 referrals will be made to SACPA services during FY 2002/03. See Table 11 for estimates by county of referrals (number and percentage of total) from either the court/probation or parole system, as well as the total number of referrals estimated for FY 2002/03.

Table 11					
Estimated Referrals (number and percentage) by Source for the 37 Small Counties for FY 2002/03					
County Name	Referrals from Court/Probation		Referrals from Parole		Total Estimated Number of Referrals
	Number	%	Number	%	
Alpine	10	90.9%	1	9.1%	11
Amador	50	89.3%	6	10.7%	56
Butte	476	81.4%	109	18.6%	585
Calaveras	50	90.9%	5	9.1%	55
Colusa	100	94.3%	6	5.7%	106
Del Norte	35	77.8%	10	22.2%	45
El Dorado	175	94.6%	10	5.4%	185
Glenn	97	90.7%	10	9.3%	107
Humboldt	305	92.4%	25	7.6%	330
Imperial	300	93.8%	20	6.2%	320
Inyo	20	90.9%	2	9.1%	22
Kings	200	85.1%	35	14.9%	235
Lake	230	92.0%	20	8.0%	250
Lassen	60	87.0%	9	13.0%	69
Madera	210	84.0%	40	16.0%	250
Marin	124	86.1%	20	13.9%	144
Mariposa	30	100.0%	0	0.0%	30
Mendocino	150	88.2%	20	11.8%	170
Merced	320	80.0%	80	20.0%	400
Modoc	10	90.9%	1	9.1%	11
Mono	47	94.0%	3	6.0%	50
Napa	477	96.8%	16	3.2%	493
Nevada	100	66.7%	50	33.3%	150
Placer	400	95.2%	20	4.8%	420
Plumas	25	92.6%	2	7.4%	27
San Benito	80	85.1%	14	14.9%	94
San Luis	400	88.9%	50	11.1%	450
Santa Cruz	429	89.9%	48	10.1%	477
Shasta	420	91.3%	40	8.7%	460
Sierra	12	70.6%	5	29.4%	17
Siskiyou	30	75.0%	10	25.0%	40
Sutter	230	88.5%	30	11.5%	260
Tehama	100	80.7%	24	19.3%	124
Trinity	100	96.0%	4	4.0%	104
Tuolumne	188	94.0%	12	6.0%	200
Yolo	292	80.2%	72	19.8%	364
Yuba	95	79.2%	25	20.8%	120
37-County Total		88.2%	854	11.8%	7,231

e. Drug Testing

For FY 2002/03, 36 of the 37 small counties plan to fund drug testing of SACPA-eligible clients.

f. Assessment and Placement

Thirty-six of the 37 small counties said that substance abuse treatment professionals would be involved with the assessment and placement of SACPA-eligible clients.

Twenty-one (58.3%) of these 36 counties stated that multiple entities (e.g., alcohol/drug treatment agency, probation, and courts) would be responsible for the assessment and placement process, indicating a team approach. Thirty-five (97.2%) of these 36 counties plan to use the ASI as one of the assessment tools, and seven (19.4%) said that the ASI would be the only tool used. Twenty-three (63.9%) of these 36 counties stated that the ASAM PPC would be one of the assessment tools for SACPA-eligible clients.

For the 37 small counties:

- The average percentage of SACPA funds planned to be spent from the FY 2000/01 allocation was 30.5% (range: 0% to 100.0%).
- The average percentage of funds planned to be spent from the FY 2001/02 allocation was 59.1% (range: 5.1% to 100.0%).
- For FY 2002/03, the average percentage of funds planned to be spent is 84.9% (range: 24.3% to 100.0%).

2. Fiscal Analysis

This section discusses funds planned to be spent in FY 2001/02, funds budgeted for FY 2002/03, and services and activities planned to be funded in the 37 small counties. As with the other counties, the small counties carried over funds in order to create a flexible reserve that can be modified or adjusted as the actual impact of SACPA is realized over time.

a. Funds Expended in FY 2001/02

In FY 2001/02, the average percentage of funds planned to be spent for these 37 counties was 59.1% (range: 5.1% to 100.0%). Table 12 summarizes the FY 2001/02 SACPA total funds available (allocation plus carryover) for the 37 small counties, the county-reported amount planned to be spent, and the percentage planned to be spent.

Table 12			
Funds Planned to be Spent in FY 2001/02 as Reported by Each Small County			
County Name	Total Funds Available	Available Funds Planned to be Spent (\$)	Available Funds Planned to be Spent (%)
Alpine	\$231,615	\$11,828	5.1%
Amador	\$332,400	\$239,398	72.0%
Butte	\$1,112,030	\$606,156	54.5%
Calaveras	\$436,089	\$245,976	56.4%
Colusa	\$368,914	\$143,689	38.9%
Del Norte	\$365,405	\$56,872	15.6%
El Dorado	\$836,385	\$536,385	64.1%
Glenn	\$324,866	\$114,771	35.3%
Humboldt	\$671,641	\$359,532	53.5%
Imperial	\$899,828	\$614,140	68.3%
Inyo	\$321,695	\$104,900	32.6%
Kings	\$515,234	\$155,748	30.2%
Lake	\$477,995	\$430,211	90.0%
Lassen	\$344,782	\$311,391	90.3%
Madera	\$623,797	\$443,890	71.2%
Marin	\$1,072,983	\$964,350	89.9%
Mariposa	\$223,710	\$223,710	100.0%
Mendocino	\$678,989	\$420,950	62.0%
Merced	\$927,168	\$525,378	56.7%
Modoc	\$260,086	\$116,020	44.6%
Mono	\$300,719	\$222,338	73.9%
Napa	\$691,288	\$580,298	83.9%
Nevada	\$540,453	\$208,047	38.5%
Placer	\$1,276,158	\$785,011	61.5%
Plumas	\$391,947	\$159,150	40.6%
San Benito	\$338,527	\$251,773	74.4%
San Luis Obispo	\$1,111,023	\$663,035	59.7%
Santa Cruz	\$1,505,619	\$991,177	65.8%
Shasta	\$945,689	\$723,947	76.6%
Sierra	\$252,889	\$152,889	60.5%
Siskiyou	\$545,640	\$284,057	52.1%
Sutter	\$381,449	\$214,619	56.3%
Tehama	\$422,602	\$332,864	78.8%
Trinity	\$279,436	\$82,250	29.4%
Tuolumne	\$410,640	\$379,013	92.3%
Yolo	\$1,118,667	\$602,575	53.9%
Yuba	\$601,646	\$345,907	57.5%
37-County Mean	\$598,378	\$367,682	59.1 %

b. Funds Planned for Expenditure for FY 2002/03

The amount of available funds for FY 2002/03 includes the FY 2002/03 allocation for this fiscal year plus any funds unspent from FY 2001/02 (carryover funds). The average percentage of funds planned for expenditure in FY 2002/03 by the 37 small counties is 84.9% (range: 24.3% to 100.0%). Seventeen (45.9%) of the 37 small counties plan to obligate all (100.0%) of the funds available, while twenty counties do not plan to expend all available funds for FY 2002/03. The range of funds planned to be spent by these 20 counties is between 24.3% and 97.5% of total available funds. Table 13 summarizes the percentage of available funds in FY 2002/03 planned to be spent by each county.

Table 13			
Funds Planned to be Spent in FY 2002/03 as Reported by Each Small County			
County Name	Total Funds Available	Available Funds Planned to be Spent (\$)	Available Funds Planned to be Spent (%)
Alpine	\$371,193	\$215,438	58.0%
Amador	\$331,968	\$312,593	94.2%
Butte	\$1,335,920	\$1,335,920	100.0%
Calaveras	\$483,591	\$483,591	100.0%
Colusa	\$451,918	\$451,918	100.0%
Del Norte	\$566,889	\$137,561	24.3%
El Dorado	\$895,276	\$595,276	66.5%
Glenn	\$475,392	\$475,392	100.0%
Humboldt	\$802,710	\$802,710	100.0%
Imperial	\$1,074,693	\$865,867	80.6%
Inyo	\$427,911	\$211,116	49.3%
Kings	\$869,193	\$617,954	71.1%
Lake	\$464,413	\$464,413	100.0%
Lassen	\$288,322	\$166,197	57.6%
Madera	\$684,029	\$449,181	65.7%
Marin	\$829,942	\$829,942	100.0%
Mariposa	\$206,356	\$206,356	100.0%
Mendocino	\$748,864	\$637,481	85.1%
Merced	\$1,166,767	\$1,166,767	100.0%
Modoc	\$320,177	\$215,000	67.2%
Mono	\$293,451	\$293,451	100.0%
Napa	\$605,310	\$605,310	100.0%
Nevada	\$692,979	\$675,899	97.5%
Placer	\$1,396,058	\$1,145,529	82.1%
Plumas	\$485,616	\$387,469	79.8%
San Benito	\$362,104	\$362,104	100.0%
San Luis Obispo	\$1,235,012	\$1,193,393	96.6%
Santa Cruz	\$1,544,609	\$1,544,609	100.0%
Shasta	\$931,193	\$931,193	100.0%
Sierra	\$268,579	\$268,579	100.0%
Siskiyou	\$591,435	\$200,000	33.8%
Sutter	\$541,768	\$541,768	100.0%
Tehama	\$440,801	\$440,801	100.0%
Trinity	\$420,535	\$223,349	53.1%
Tuolumne	\$357,324	\$325,697	91.1%
Yolo	\$1,241,946	\$1,162,531	93.6%
Yuba	\$640,560	\$597,325	93.3%
37-County Mean	\$671,481	\$582,154	84.9%

c. Services and Activities

c. Services and Activities

This section discusses the various services or activities that will be provided by the 37 small counties, including drug treatment and other services (vocational training, literacy training, family counseling, etc.), and criminal justice activities (supervision and monitoring). Table 14 summarizes the percentages of funds planned to be spent for services and criminal justice activities for FY 2002/03 for these 37 counties.

1. Services

This category combines drug treatment and other services (i.e., literacy training, vocational training, family counseling) that will be provided by the counties under SACPA. The average percentage of funds planned to be spent for drug treatment and other services by these 37 counties in FY 2002/03 is 77.6% (range: 51.0% to 100.0%).

For the 37 small counties:

- In FY 2002/03, an average of 77.6% of SACPA funds is planned for drug treatment and other services.
- For FY 2001/02, an average of 15.2% of SACPA funds was planned to be spent on probation, supervision, monitoring and other related activities.
- For FY 2002/03, an average of 22.4% of SACPA funds is planned to be spent on probation, supervision, monitoring and other related activities.

2. Criminal Justice

This category includes funding for probation, supervision, monitoring, and other related activities. The average amount of funds being planned to be spent for criminal justice activities by the 37 small counties is 22.4% (range: 0% to 49.0%).

In comparison, during FY 2001/02, the average amount planned to be spent by these 37 counties was 20.0%.

Table 14			
Percentage of Funds Planned to be Spent for Drug Treatment and Other Services and Criminal Justice Activities for the 37 Small Counties for FY 2002/03			
County Name	Total Amount of Funds Planned to be Spent	Percentage Planned for Services	Percentage Planned for Criminal Justice Activities
Alpine	\$215,438	78.7%	21.3%
Amador	\$312,593	82.8%	17.2%
Butte	\$1,335,920	68.0%	32.0%
Calaveras	\$483,591	84.3%	15.7%
Colusa	\$451,918	85.4%	14.6%
Del Norte	\$137,561	65.5%	34.5%
El Dorado	\$595,276	78.1%	21.9%
Glenn	\$475,392	90.7%	9.3%
Humboldt	\$802,710	76.0%	24.0%
Imperial	\$865,867	78.7%	21.3%
Inyo	\$211,116	78.7%	21.3%
Kings	\$617,954	67.4%	32.6%
Lake	\$464,413	64.5%	35.5%
Lassen	\$166,197	74.9%	25.1%
Madera	\$449,181	81.3%	18.7%
Marin	\$829,942	80.8%	19.2%
Mariposa	\$206,356	60.1%	39.9%
Mendocino	\$637,481	84.2%	15.8%
Merced	\$1,166,767	85.0%	15.0%
Modoc	\$215,000	81.4%	18.6%
Mono	\$293,451	82.4%	17.6%
Napa	\$605,310	89.2%	10.8%
Nevada	\$675,899	68.7%	31.3%
Placer	\$1,145,529	87.7%	12.3%
Plumas	\$387,469	65.3%	34.7%
San Benito	\$362,104	87.6%	12.4%
San Luis Obispo	\$1,193,393	70.2%	29.8%
Santa Cruz	\$1,544,609	87.7%	12.3%
Shasta	\$931,193	84.1%	15.9%
Sierra	\$268,579	78.7%	21.3%
Siskiyou	\$200,000	100.0%	0%
Sutter	\$541,768	58.4%	41.6%
Tehama	\$440,801	77.4%	22.6%
Trinity	\$223,349	62.8%	37.2%
Tuolumne	\$325,697	51.0%	49.0%
Yolo	\$1,162,531	90.8%	9.2%
Yuba	\$597,325	80.9%	19.1%
37-County Mean	\$582,154	77.6%	22.4%

d. Capacity

In FY 2002/03, 19 (51.4%) of the 37 small counties project an increase in capacity for all categories of services, eight (21.6%) project no increase in all categories, and eighteen (48.6%) project no increase in at least one category. The average estimated increase in capacity of drug treatment and other services for these 37 counties is 80.6% (range: 0% to 803.7%). Six of the counties estimate an overall increase above 100.0%. In several of these counties there are few existing services in these categories, and adding new services and activities will increase their capacity by these large percentages. Table 15 presents the anticipated service capacity increases for each county. This table lists the anticipated capacity increases in non-residential and residential drug treatment, and the total increase in capacity for drug treatment and other services.

For the 37 small counties:

- In FY 2001/02, there was a projected 358.6% capacity increase in non-residential drug treatment, a 376.9% increase in residential drug treatment, and a 984.1% increase in drug treatment and other services combined.
- In FY 2002/03, there is a projected 55.2% average capacity increase in non-residential drug treatment, a 258.2% average increase in residential drug treatment, and an 80.6% average increase in drug treatment and other services combined.

Table 15			
Percentage of Planned Increase in Capacity of Non-residential and Residential Drug Treatment and All Drug Treatment and Other Services by County for the 37 Small Counties for FY 2002/03			
County Name	Capacity Increase in Non-residential Drug Treatment	Capacity Increase in Residential Drug Treatment	Total Capacity Increase (drug treatment and other services)
Alpine	0*	0*	0*
Amador	120.0%	433.3%	174.6%
Butte	3.3%	6.0%	7.1%
Calaveras	33.3%	0*	87.6%
Colusa	400.0%	350.0%	803.7%
Del Norte	0*	0*	0*
El Dorado	3.6%	33.3%	5.9%
Glenn	33.8%	74.1%	41.8%
Humboldt	40.7%	30.5%	40.5%
Imperial	29.9%	0*	24.4%
Inyo	0*	0*	6.0%
Kings	35.5%	26.7%	33.3%
Lake	0*	0*	0*
Lassen	0*	0*	0*
Madera	0*	0*	0*
Marin	26.8%	20.4%	25.7%
Mariposa	54.5%	200.0%	84.0%
Mendocino	245.9%	2,000.0%	274.2%
Merced	0*	0*	0*
Modoc	16.9%	34.6%	22.7%
Mono	92.6%	0*	73.5%
Napa	0*	4,000.0%	10.7%
Nevada	15.7%	153.1%	99.6%
Placer	53.2%	46.7%	96.3%
Plumas	215.0%	145.0%	185.4%
San Benito	0*	0*	0*
San Luis Obispo	1.0%	0*	2.2%
Santa Cruz	3.4%	0*	2.2%
Shasta	0*	0*	0*
Sierra	11.8%	22.7%	17.7%
Siskiyou	300.0%	1,900.0%	566.7%
Sutter	41.5%	3.1%	36.3%
Tehama	0*	0*	6.8%
Trinity	30.2%	23.5%	33.7%
Tuolumne	188.0%	50.0%	163.7%
Yolo	0*	0*	8.4%
Yuba	46.3%	0*	49.2%
37-County Mean	55.2%	258.2%	80.6%

*This may be due to the counties' estimate that current capacity will meet the projected number of referrals for SACPA services in the categories or in total.

3. Section Highlights

This section provides highlights of the analysis of the 37 small counties, specifically:

- The average percentage of funds planned for expenditure in FY 2002/03 by the 37 small counties is 84.9% (range: 24.3% to 100.0%).
- The average percentage of total funds available that are planned to be spent on services (drug treatment and other services) by these 37 counties is 77.6% (range: 51.0% to 100.0%); and the average percentage planned for criminal justice activities is 22.4% (range: 0% to 49.0%).
- Thirty-six (97.3%) of the 37 small counties carried over funds into FY 2002/03.
- The 37 small counties estimated that 7,231 referrals will be made for SACPA services during FY 2002/03. A majority of these referrals will come from the court/probation system.
- Twenty-nine (78.4%) of the 37 small county plans project an increase in total capacity of services during FY 2002/03. The average increase in total capacity for these 37 counties is 80.6%.
- Thirty-six of the 37 counties plan to expend funds for drug testing of SACPA clients.
- All (100.0%) of the 37 small counties stated that “impacted community parties” were involved in the SACPA planning process. Eight (21.6%) said specifically that “clients/client groups” were involved in the planning process.
- Twenty-three (62.2%) of the 37 county plans indicated that there were federally recognized American Indian tribes in the county, and that these tribes were part of the SACPA planning process.

E. Summary of the County Plans

The overall analysis of the county plans indicates that there is significant consistency among the 58 counties⁶. Based on the programmatic information provided by the counties, the SACPA services are largely directed and coordinated by health and human service agencies/professionals. In fact, 55 (94.8%) of the 58 counties identified various health and human services related agencies (e.g., department of health services, public health, behavioral health department) as the lead agency. Furthermore, 55 (94.8%) of the counties indicated that substance abuse treatment professionals would be responsible for the assessment and placement of SACPA-eligible clients. The average percentage of funds to be spent for services (drug treatment and other services) by the 58 counties is 78.5%.

There are also some important differences across county size (large, medium, and small). First, the anticipated rate of referrals per 1,000 population is highest for the medium-sized counties. Second, the expected increase in total capacity is highest among the small counties. The average of the total capacity increase for the 37 small counties is 80.6%, which is influenced by six counties reporting over a 100.0% capacity increase. If these six counties were not included in determining this average, the increase in capacity for small counties is comparable (26.3%) to the other counties (large and medium).

⁶ It should be kept in mind that these observations are based upon means for each county grouping. Means can be misleading without consideration of their variability. This section provides only a gross comparison of the data from the county groupings.

Table A1												
Planned Services by Type--Large Counties												
County Name												
	Alameda	Contra Costa	Fresno	Los Angeles	Orange	Riverside	Sacramento	San Bernadino	San Diego	San Francisco	Santa Clara	Ventura
Non-Residential/Outpatient												
Treatment/Recovery - No Meds	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
Treatment/Recovery - Methadone, LAAM, or Other Meds Prescribed	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X		X		
Day Program-Intensive	X	X	X	X		X			X	X		
Detoxification -No Meds												
Detoxification -Methadone, LAAM, or Other Meds Prescribed	X	X	X	X		X	X	X				
Residential												
Detoxification (Hospital)				X	X							
Detoxification (Non-Hospital) -No Meds	X	X	X		X	X	X	X	X			
Detoxification (Non-Hospital) -No Meds-Methadone, LAAM, or Other Meds Prescribed												
Treatment/Recovery - No Meds	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
Treatment/Recovery - Methadone, LAAM, or Other Meds Prescribed												
Other Service*												
Literacy Training	X	X	X			X	X			X		
Family Counseling		X	X		X	X	X			X		
Vocational Training	X	X	X			X	X			X	X	
Other Client Services	X	X	X		X	X	X			X	X	
Case Management Activities*												
Referral/ Assessment	X	X	X	X	X	X	X		X	X	X	X
Placement	X		X				X		X	X	X	
Court Monitoring	X	X	X	X			X		X	X	X	
Supervision	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	
Miscellaneous Activities	X	X	X			X	X		X	X		
(1)This table indicates only if SACPA funds are planned to be used to provide these services. Counties may also use other funds to provide these services.												
(2) Tables were compiled before all county plans were approved and may not reflect any final changes.												

Table A2									
Planned Services by Type -- Medium-Sized Counties									
County Name									
	Kern	Monterey	San Joaquin	San Mateo	Santa Barbara	Solano	Sonoma	Stanislaus	Tulare
Non-Residential/Outpatient									
Treatment/Recovery - No Meds	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
Treatment/Recovery - Methadone, LAAM, or Other Meds Prescribed		X		X	X		X	X	
Day Program-Intensive			X	X	X		X		X
Detoxification -No Meds									
Detoxification -Methadone, LAAM, or Other Meds Prescribed			X	X			X		
Residential									
Detoxification (Hospital)									
Detoxification (Non-Hospital) -No Meds	X		X	X	X	X			
Detoxification (Non-Hospital) -No Meds-Methadone, LAAM, or Other Meds Prescribed									
Treatment/Recovery - No Meds	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
Treatment/Recovery - Methadone, LAAM, or Other Meds Prescribed						X			
Other Service*									
Literacy Training			X						
Family Counseling			X	X					
Vocational Training			X		X				
Other Client Services			X		X		X		
Case Management Activities*									
Referral/ Assessment	X	X	X	X	X		X	X	X
Placement			X					X	
Court Monitoring			X		X			X	X
Supervision	X	X		X	X	X	X	X	X
Miscellaneous Activities					X		X	X	
(1)This table indicates only if SACPA funds are planned to be used to provide these services. Counties may also use other funds to provide these services.									
(2) Tables were compiled before all county plans were approved and may not reflect any final changes.									

Table A3												
Planned Services by Type--Small Counties												
County Name												
	Alpine	Amador	Butte	Calaveras	Colusa	Del Norte	El Dorado	Glenn	Humboldt	Imperial	Inyo	Kings
Non-Residential/Outpatient												
Treatment/Recovery - No Meds	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x
Treatment/Recovery - Methadone, LAAM, or Other Meds Prescribed	x	x								x		x
Day Program-Intensive	x	x	x						x			x
Detoxification -No Meds	x	x										
Detoxification -Methadone, LAAM, or Other Meds Prescribed	x	x										
Residential												
Detoxification (Hospital)	x	x										
Detoxification (Non-Hospital) -No Meds	x	x		x					x			x
Detoxification (Non-Hospital) -No Meds-Methadone, LAAM, or Other Meds Prescribed	x	x					x					x
Treatment/Recovery - No Meds	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x
Treatment/Recovery - Methadone, LAAM, or Other Meds Prescribed	x											
Other Service*												
Literacy Training	x	x		x	x	x	x		x			x
Family Counseling	x	x		x	x	x	x	x	x		x	x
Vocational Training	x	x		x	x	x	x		x			x
Other Client Services		x		x	x		x			x		x
Case Management Activities*												
Referral/ Assessment	x	x			x	x	x	x	x		x	x
Placement	x	x			x	x	x	x	x		x	x
Court Monitoring	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x		x	x
Supervision	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x
Miscellaneous Activities							x					x
(1)This table indicates only if SACPA funds are planned to be used to provide these services. Counties may also use other funds to provide these services.												
(2) Tables were compiled before all county plans were approved and may not reflect any final changes.												

Table A3												
Planned Services by Type--Small Counties												
County Name												
	Lake	Lassen	Madera	Marin	Mariposa	Mendocino	Merced	Modoc	Mono	Napa	Nevada	Placer
Non-Residential/Outpatient												
Treatment/Recovery - No Meds	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x
Treatment/Recovery - Methadone, LAAM, or Other Meds Prescribed				x								x
Day Program-Intensive		x		x	x			x			x	x
Detoxification -No Meds												
Detoxification -Methadone, LAAM, or Other Meds Prescribed											x	
Residential												
Detoxification (Hospital)				x							x	
Detoxification (Non-Hospital) -No Meds	x	x	x		x	x		x		x	x	x
Detoxification (Non-Hospital) -No Meds- Methadone, LAAM, or Other Meds Prescribed											x	
Treatment/Recovery - No Meds	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x
Treatment/Recovery - Methadone, LAAM, or Other Meds Prescribed					x							
Other Service*												
Literacy Training					x	x					x	x
Family Counseling			x		x	x		x		x	x	x
Vocational Training						x					x	x
Other Client Services			x					x		x		x
Case Management Activities*												
Referral/ Assessment	x	x	x	x	x	x		x		x	x	x
Placement	x	x	x	x	x			x		x	x	x
Court Monitoring	x		x	x	x		x			x	x	x
Supervision	x		x	x	x		x	x	x	x	x	x
Miscellaneous Activities		x								x	x	x

Table A3													
Planned Services by Type--Small Counties													
County Name													
	Plumas	San Benito	San Luis Obispo	Santa Cruz	Shasta	Sierra	Siskiyou	Sutter	Tehama	Trinity	Toulumne	Yolo	Yuba
Non-Residential/Outpatient													
Treatment/Recovery - No Meds	x	x	x	x	x	x		x	x	x	x	x	x
Treatment/Recovery - Methadone, LAAM, or Other Meds Prescribed	x	x		x								x	
Day Program-Intensive	x		x	x	x		x		x	x		x	x
Detoxification -No Meds													
Detoxification -Methadone, LAAM, or Other Meds Prescribed		x											x
Residential													
Detoxification (Hospital)	x												
Detoxification (Non-Hospital) -No Meds	x	x		x			x	x				x	
Detoxification (Non-Hospital) -No Meds-Methadone, LAAM, or Other Meds Prescribed													
Treatment/Recovery - No Meds		x		x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x
Treatment/Recovery - Methadone, LAAM, or Other Meds Prescribed			x										
Other Service*													
Literacy Training	x			x		x		x				x	
Family Counseling	x	x						x	x			x	
Vocational Training	x			x				x				x	
Other Client Services			x	x	x							x	
Case Management Activities*													
Referral/ Assessment	x	x	x	x		x		x	x	x	x	x	x
Placement	x					x			x	x		x	
Court Monitoring	x	x	x		x	x		x		x	x	x	x
Supervision	x	x	x	x	x	x			x	x	x	x	
Miscellaneous Activities						x							